Claims 1-9 and 11-16 are now pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, 11, and 16 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicants have amended claim 9 to recite a non-transitory computer readable medium. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art discussed on pages 6-7 of the specification (referred to as AAPA) in view of Varadarajan et al. The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Varadarajan et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 6,640,140 to Lindner et al.

The combination of AAPA and Varadarajan et al. does not suggest the claimed invention since, among other things, the combination does not suggest downloading from a Control System to a client device a first software object including a representation of an Aspect Object and Aspects associated with the Aspect Object and downloading from the Control System to the client device a second software object comprising a representation of an Aspect Category and an Aspect Type. AAPA suggests that these components reside within a control system of a real world object. The first and second software objects permit any client device located anywhere to

control functions of the real world object.

Varadarajan et al. only suggests buying and selling software components over the internet. Even if somehow AAPA were somehow provided with such software vending capabilities, the combination would not suggest the distributed look-up function and query capabilities according to the claimed invention. Nor would providing AAPA with software vending capabilities suggest controlling with a client device functions of real world objects. AAPA only suggests control with a control system of the real world objects. Providing the control system of the real world object with software vending capabilities would still not suggest the claimed invention. The combination would still not suggest such distributed look-up, query and control, only exchange of software.

Other elements of the claimed invention not suggested by AAPA and Varadarajan et al. include requesting with the information in the first software component and the second software component a representation of an Aspect System Object, downloading the representation of the Aspect System Object to the client device hosting the web client application wherein the function of the real world object is enabled for access, initializing the Aspect System Object in the client device, querying a reference to an interface of the Aspect Object with a web client application in the client device external to the Control System through the internet or an intranet, wherein the Aspect Object comprises a Composite Object comprising Aspects of the Aspect Object, carrying out with the web client application a table look-up local to the client device of a reference to the Aspects of the Aspect Object, wherein the Aspects implement a function of the real world device, and implementing with the client the function of the real world object.

As discussed in the specification, the claimed invention provides significant advantages over the art discussed there since the claimed invention carries out querying and look-up functions on a client rather than utilizing resources of the control system of the real world object. As such, the claimed invention more efficiently utilizes resources of the control system and provides for increased reliability in the control of real world objects. The combination of AAPA and Varadarajan et al. does not suggest the claimed invention or the advantages achievable thereby. AAPA suggests that look-up, query and control remain in the control system of a device-not a remote client device. Varadarajan et al. only suggests a scheme for buying and selling software, whereas the claimed invention permits a client to access a function of a real world object to control the real world object.

AAPA requires software, such as dynamic link libraries to be preinstalled in the client devices. AAPA also does not suggest how to resolve access to an aspect of an aspect object utilizing internet technology. These represent significant differences with the claimed invention, which utilizes a web client application, such as a web browser.

Accordingly, the combination of AAPA and Varadarajan et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-16. Therefore, the invention recited in claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-16 is not obvious in view of the combination of AAPA and Varadarajan et al. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of AAPA, Varadarajan et al. and Lindner et al. does not suggest the

invention recited in claim 13 since, among other things, Lindner et al. does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of the combination of AAPA and Varadarajan et al. Along these lines, Lindner et al. does not suggest downloading from a Control System to a client device a first software object including a representation of an Aspect Object and Aspects associated with the Aspect Object and downloading from the Control System to the client device a second software object comprising a representation of an Aspect Category and an Aspect Type.

Lindner et al. also does not suggest requesting with the information in the first software component and the second software component a representation of an Aspect System Object, downloading the representation of the Aspect System Object to the client device hosting the web client application wherein the function of the real world object is enabled for access, initializing the Aspect System Object in the client device, querying a reference to an interface of the Aspect Object with a web client application in the client device external to the Control System through the internet or an intranet, wherein the Aspect Object comprises a Composite Object comprising Aspects of the Aspect Object, carrying out with the web client application a table look-up local to the client device of a reference to the Aspects of the Aspect Object, wherein the Aspects implement a function of the real world device, and implementing with the client the function of the real world object.

In view of the above, the combination of AAPA, Varadarajan et al. and Lindner et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 13. It follows that the invention recited in claim 13 is not obvious in view of the combination of AAPA, Varadarajan et al. and Lindner et al. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action do suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is patentable over the cited references and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based on the cited references.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 24, 2010

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicant
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300